

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application.

Figures 1 and 2 are objected to because Figures 1 and 2 only illustrate which is old and are not designated as "Prior Art". In response, Replacement Sheet corresponding to the corrected Figures 1 and 2 are submitted herewith and accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bao et al (US Patent No. 6,241,397, hereinafter "Bao") in view of Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,700,706, hereinafter "Chang"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Bao discloses a Fabry-Perot filter having a plurality of optical fibers within a single F-P cavity. As admitted by the Examiner, Bao fails to disclose that the second angle of incidence differs from the first angle of incidence.

Chang discloses a Fabry-Perot filter device, which include a Fabry-Perot element and a reflecting prism for reflecting light passed through the Fabry-Perot element back to the the Fabry-Perot element. Chang does not mention that the angles of incidence of the two passes are different. As illustrated in Figure 6 of Chang, the incidences of the two passes are in the same angle, which is  $\Phi/2$ . In other embodiments of Chang, such as Figure 4 and 5, the incidences of the different passes are also at the same angle, which is  $0^\circ$ . Thus, Change fails to cure the deficiency of Bao.

As recited in claim 1, the second angle of incidence ( $\theta_2$ ) differs from the first angle of incidence ( $\theta_1$ ). In the present invention as reflected in Claim 1, the difference between angle of incidence in the two passes permits to obtain a multiplying of two transfer functions of spectrally offset Fabry-Perrot filters.

Based on the above reasons, even if Bao and Chang can be combined, both Bao and Chang fail to discloses the second angle of incidence ( $\theta_2$ ) differs from the first angle

of incidence ( $\theta_1$ ). Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ip (US Patent No. 5,283,845, hereinafter "Ip") in view of Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,700,706). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Ip teaches a wavelength-selective optical filtering component. As admitted in the Office Action, Ip differs from claim 1 in that Ip fails to teach the second angle of incidence differs from the first angle of incidence. In addition, the Examiner contends that Chang cures the deficiency of Bao. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. As discussed above, Chang merely teaches the incidences of the two passes are at the same angle, for example,  $\Phi/2$  or  $0^\circ$ . Nowhere does Chang mention the second angle of incidence differs from the first angle of incidence.

Therefore, even if Ip and Chang can be combined, both Ip and Chang fail to disclose the second angle of incidence differs from the first angle of incidence. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4 and 7 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 and should be patentable over Ip and Chang for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ip (US Patent No. 5,283,845, hereinafter "Ip") in view of Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,700,706) and further in view of Bao et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 and should be patentable over Ip and Chang for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**



Kenneth M. Berner  
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
**Date: February 20, 2008**  
**KMB/ser**